DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 336 EA 020 122

AUTHOR Streifer, Philip A.
TITLE Teacher Evaluation Systems: A Review of Critical Issues and the Current State of the Art.
INSTITUTION Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands, Andover, MA.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 17p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands, 290 South Main St., Andover, MA 01810 ($3.00, plus $2.50 shipping and handling).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluators; Formative Evaluation; *Program Design; *Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Rhode Island

ABSTRACT

When formative feedback in teacher evaluation programs results in a summative decision, teacher evaluation programs fulfill both formative and summative needs. Teacher evaluation programs that fulfill both formative and summative needs should include components such as consistent and just policies and procedures; evaluation criteria that agree with teacher effectiveness research; a method for setting performance standards; and administrator training for teacher evaluation. While poorly defined criteria result in failure, clearly defined evaluation criteria result in improved instruction. An alternative to problematic rating scale evaluation is the descriptor achievement system, which is founded on teachers' exhibition of clearly defined skills. The efficiency of this system depends on the training of the observers. The elements of administrator training for teacher evaluation include knowledge of teacher effectiveness research, evaluation methods, data collection, and conference methods. School districts should monitor their teacher evaluation programs to assess where improvement is necessary, involve teachers in the program, and stick to the chief components of the program. The efficiency of teacher evaluation programs relies on the combined strength of its components. Fifteen references, five footnotes, two appendices, and a copy of the District Self-Assessment Checklist for Teacher Evaluation are included. (RG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David P. Crandall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED295336

Teacher Evaluation Systems: A Review of Critical Issues and the Current State of the Art

by

Philip A. Streifer, Ph.D.

for the
Rhode Island Leadership Academy

August 1987

Published by

The Regional Laboratory
for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands
290 South Main Street, Andover, Massachusetts 01810

EA020122

Teacher Evaluation Systems: A Review of Critical Issues and the Current State of the Art

Introduction

. . . what should a good teacher evaluation program do - serve the needs of the many by focusing on formative feedback or the few by stressing summative evaluation?

Despite the common notion that an effective teacher evaluation program weeds out the dead wood, the simple fact of the matter is that very few teachers are actually fired as a result of formal evaluation even with the best of programs. In reality, most teachers are good at what they do. Many could stand improvement while very few are so bad that they need to be fired. So what should a good teacher evaluation program do -- serve the needs of the many by focusing on formative feedback or the few by stressing summative evaluation? It is argued that supervision and evaluation are mutually exclusive, that a supervisor cannot function effectively if he/she must also serve in the summative role. But if a process is established in which useful formative feedback is provided early in the cycle eventually leading to a summative decision, an evaluation program can serve both purposes with the administrator having clearly defined roles at different stages of the process.

What is needed from an evaluation perspective is a framework within which all of the important teaching criteria and instructional models can be successfully operationalized. Teacher evaluation will necessarily cover a wide range of behavior from sound pedagogy to coming to work on time, yet the system must retain enough flexibility to allow for the incorporation of the many outstanding instructional models that become available. This paper will posit such a framework.

This paper will propose that a teacher evaluation program which serves both the formative and summative needs of a school district must include four major components. These components should be considered design requirements for an effective teacher supervision and evaluation program.

To put the content of this paper in perspective, it is important to distinguish between teacher evaluation, formative supervision and other informal staff development activities coming under the rubric of instructional supervision. Summative teacher evaluation is the direct responsibility of the school district along with formative supervision, both of which should be part of the same process. Further, if one expects instructional supervision activities to operate as part of the formal formative process, then the terms are synonymous. However, a great deal of teacher improvement can take place outside the scope of formal evaluation. Teachers may become involved with informal peer supervision, coaching and mentoring. They may learn about various instructional models through inservice and want to test their effectiveness in the classroom. Toward this end, teachers may ask for assistance from one of their supervisors or peers. From this perspective, these activities are outside the purview of teacher evaluation since they are not tied to any formal district-wide program nor are they a district expectation. Because this paper is focused on developing the components of a district-wide system of evaluation, it is necessarily limited to a description of the formal evaluation process.

Design Requirements for an Effective Evaluation Program

This paper will propose that a teacher evaluation program which serves both the formative and summative needs of a school district must include four major components. These components should be considered design requirements for an effective teacher supervision and evaluation program. First, a set of policies and procedures must be established to ensure fairness, consistency and due process. Second, the evaluation criteria selected by a district must relate to the teacher effectiveness literature for validity and usefulness. Third, a statistically defensible and practical method of setting performance standards must be established. Also, a reliable system of measuring teaching against those standards must be implemented. Finally, administrators must be adequately trained in all aspects of the program. It is important to note that these four components are not mutually exclusive. When any one of the four links is weakened, the entire model is subject to failure. Hence a school district must be prepared to undertake development activity in all areas for the program to be successful.

When any one of the four links is weakened, the entire model is subject to failure. Hence a school district must be prepared to undertake development activity in all areas for the program to be successful.

Establishing Policies and Procedures.

Ask most teachers what is wrong with their present teacher evaluation program and they will usually cite the inconsistency with which it is carried out. If teachers are to internalize the recommendations of the evaluation program and work to improve, they must perceive that the program was carried out with consistency and that they have been treated fairly. Therefore a set of procedures must be established which outlines the types of data to be collected, the manner and frequency with which it may be collected, whether classroom observations will be announced or unannounced, whether a pre and post conference will be held and within what time limits and the type and intensity of the assistance offered when a teacher is found to be below acceptable levels of performances. Further, the district must be cognizant of the fact that formative supervision takes time. Teachers should be given two to three years to improve. Only after this intensive assistance fails to adequately improve teacher performance should termination proceedings begin.

. . . the district must be cognizant of the fact that formative supervision takes time. Teachers should be given two to three years to improve. Only after this intensive assistance fails to adequately improve teacher performance should termination proceedings begin.

While the due process right of teachers is well established, it simply protects from indiscriminate treatment with respect to employment. When the evaluation criteria are based on the teacher effectiveness literature and due process and assistance have been afforded, a termination decision is justifiable. A teacher's property right is not an absolute guarantee. If a teacher is harming students because of incompetence and refuses to improve or fails to meet a minimum level of acceptable performance after having been offered intensive assistance, then that teacher should be discharged.

The Evaluation Criteria

A supervision program is only as good as the criteria that it professes to supervise. Well defined criteria that describe sound instructional technique will result in improved instruction. Poorly defined or irrelevant criteria will result in a waste of time for all involved and justifiably frustrate and angry teachers. Two major issues must be considered here -- the validity of the criteria and the degree to which those criteria are defined.

In 1977 the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare 1977) established the regulations to which states must adhere in determining the criteria used for teacher certification. The EEOC required that these criteria, which states use in assessing and certifying beginning teachers, must be developed through a job analysis. Subsequently, a number of states including Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina have employed large scale job analyses to identify their assessment criteria (Education Commission on the States 1985) . Although these assessment programs focus on beginning teachers, the criteria for career teachers are not too different as evidenced by the Dade County model (Dade County Public Schools 1983) and others. Only the performance standards typically change. School districts should look to these lists of teaching criteria as a place to begin their criteria selection process.

Connecticut is currently developing a state-of-the-art instrument for assessing teaching performance focusing on key indicators of instructional pedagogy.

Streifer (1987) performed a comparative analysis of all the content valid teaching lists from state-wide programs in use around the country. The result of that comparative analysis is a set of generic teaching skills grouped by pedagogical category that school districts can review and use for their teacher evaluation programs. Most of the broad teaching skills listed have three levels of definition in order to facilitate their interpretation, improve the quality of formative feedback to teachers, and increase rater reliability. Appendices A and B list sample criteria from that study. Districts should also consult other sources such as the Dade County (Dade County Public Schools 1983), Georgia (Georgia Department of Education 1986) and South Carolina (South Carolina Department of Education 1986) competency lists. Moreover, Connecticut is currently developing a state-of-the-art instrument for assessing teaching performance focusing on key indicators of instructional pedagogy.[1] Due to be completed this Fall, it will provide school districts with an outstanding model for review.

Establishing Performance Standards and Measuring Teaching Against These Standards.

Many teacher evaluation programs use some sort of rating scale for assessing teacher performance. Typically these rating scales have five to seven points ranging from outstanding to poor. The district (or individual prin-

cipal) must decide on some cut-off score below which a teacher will be considered to be deficient typical rating scale is shown below.

5	4	3	2	1
Outstanding	Good	Average	Fair	Poor

Using this rating scale, a district might decide that any rating below a three (3) is cause for concern. Unfortunately, use of this type of rating scale is fraught with difficulties ranging from unresolved psychometric problems to matters of practical application.[2]

While the descriptor achievement paradigm is not a panacea, it does provide for a defensible system of measurement while relying on professional judgment.

In Connecticut, Florida, Georgia and South Carolina, policy makers have opted for a system termed the "descriptor achievement system." Furthermore, the Dade County (Florida) assessment program for career teachers also uses this system for rating and measuring teacher performance. Some of these programs have been operating for over ten years as in the Georgia case. Connecticut, a newcomer to the process, has recently decided to base their assessment program on this model.[3] While the descriptor achievement paradigm is not a panacea, it does provide for a defensible system of measurement while relying on professional judgment.

The descriptor achievement system is based on a teacher's demonstration of clearly defined skills. Unlike most teacher evaluation criteria checklists, the criteria in this model are clearly stated in behavioral language as shown in Table 1 (see Appendix B for a full description of the criteria). When an administrator observes the classroom, he/she decides whether (a) the skill was satisfactorily demonstrated, (b) the skill was not demonstrated but should have been or (c) there was no opportunity to demonstrate the skill. Only in case "b" is a teacher denied credit for the skill. If a skill is satisfactorily demonstrated or there was no opportunity to demonstrate it, the teacher is given credit.

The success of this system rests with the assumption that all observers have undergone extensive training to ensure accuracy (validity) and consistency (reliability).

The success of this system rests with the assumption that all observers have undergone extensive training to ensure accuracy (validity) and consistency (reliability). Districts must be prepared to undertake initial training for administrators as well as follow up "recalibration" when an administrator's ratings begin to show signs of drift.[4] Once a district has made the decision to use the descriptor achievement system, setting performance standards is an easy task. Following the same model used by the aforementioned state assessment programs, a school district decides how many descriptors from each category must be demonstrated to meet the district minimum standard. For example, using the discipline competency from Streifer (1987) shown in Table 1, a district could determine that six (6) of the eight (8) descriptors listed must be rated as having been "demonstrated" to meet the district standard. Any six of the eight would have to be demonstrated by the teacher to achieve the minimum performance standard. Districts should not weight any descriptors in an attempt to make any of them more important than others nor should they determine that any descriptors must be present within the minimum standard of six. Doing so raises serious unresolved psychometric problems. However, districts do retain flexibility in determining the actual criteria and standards.

Table 1
Discipline Descriptors from Streifer's Comparative Analysis

Maintains fair and consistent discipline:

1. Expectations for behavior conducive to learning are stated or have been established.
2. Consistent expectations about behavior are maintained throughout the lesson
3. Behavior of the entire class is monitored throughout the lesson.
4. Firmness of the teacher in managing behavior conveys confidence.
5. Learners who interfere with instruction are identified and dealt with appropriately (e.g., firmly, with suitable consequences for situation, effectively, etc.)
6. Learners are provided verbal and non-verbal feedback about specific behavior(s).
7. When correcting misbehavior, the teacher provides for appropriate behavioral alternatives.
8. The teacher calls attention to desirable behaviors.

By using adequately defined criteria that are observed and evaluated by properly trained administrators, valuable formative feedback can be provided to teachers regarding those skills at which they are proficient as well as those in need of improvement.

In using this model, independent summative decisions are made for each category of teaching skills. There are any number of alternative methods of aggregating data from independent observations over the course of a year that are beyond the scope of this paper to describe. However, it is entirely feasible to implement a program that ensures consistency, accuracy and fairness to teachers. By using adequately defined criteria that are observed and evaluated by properly trained administrators, valuable formative feedback can be provided to teachers regarding those skills at which they are proficient as well as those in need of improvement.

The Need for Training.

School administrators should not overlook the value of teacher evaluation in terms of school improvement. A sound teacher evaluation program will improve teaching and improved teaching is a key variable in effective schools.

Throughout this paper references have been made to the need for administrative training. Since this model is labor intensive, as are most evaluation programs, it will not work without adequate training provided to those individuals who will be expected to carry it out. Moreover, carrying out a teacher evaluation program, even for well trained administrators, is hard work. Yet the investment in time and energy is well worth the effort. School administrators should not overlook the value of teacher evaluation in terms of school improvement. A sound teacher evaluation program will improve teaching and improved teaching is a key variable in effective schools. The need for administrative training comes in three areas: knowledge of the teacher effectiveness literature, data collection/evaluation techniques and, conference techniques.

First, administrators need to know about sound instructional design. Since the teacher effectiveness literature is vast and instructional models

abound, administrators need help separating the good from the bad. Secondly, they need training on how to collect data and render reliable judgments with respect to the criteria and the established district performance standards. While this may seem an overly burdensome task, experience in Dade County (Florida), Georgia and South Carolina demonstrates that this training can be efficient and reliable.[5] Finally, training will be needed in conference techniques. There are ways to present evaluation findings that will help ensure that teachers internalize recommendations and work to improve instruction. When improperly handled however, even the most valid data cannot overcome angry and defensive teachers. Since the primary goal of this program is the improvement of instruction, quality training in all of these areas, and especially the last, will be required.

There are ways to present evaluation findings that will help ensure that teachers internalize recommendations and work to improve instruction. When improperly handled however, even the most valid data cannot overcome angry and defensive teachers.

Implementation Steps

As a first step in the development process, school districts should audit their teacher evaluation programs to determine where improvement will be required. Each phase of the evaluation program should be reviewed as outlined in this paper. For example, districts might ask a series of questions such as: Do the evaluation policies and procedures ensure consistent application of all aspects of the program across the district? Is due process ensured? Are the evaluation criteria based on the teacher effectiveness literature and written in clear behavioral language? Have minimum performance standards been established and is the rating method statistically defensible? What provisions are made for providing meaningful assistance to teachers falling below the district standards? Have review procedures been established to ensure periodic revisiting of the criteria, performance standards and policies? Is there a system in place for monitoring rater drift (loss of rater reliability)? Has adequate training been provided to administrators in all aspects of program implementation, i.e., teacher effectiveness literature and criteria, data collection/evaluation techniques and conference skills? When a district satisfactorily addresses each of these issues, an effective teacher evaluation program will be in place.

Experience demonstrates that teacher involvement in the evaluation program strengthens rather than weakens it's effectiveness

Furthermore, school districts should actively involve teachers in the development and implementation of the evaluation program. Experience demonstrates that teacher involvement in the evaluation program strengthens rather than weakens it's effectiveness (Wise, Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1984).

Finally, administrators should realize that they have a great deal of flexibility in the design of their programs. There are no absolute rules to follow in the establishment of policies and procedures, selection of criteria, setting of performance standards or training models employed. However, districts should adhere to the major components of the program or framework that has been outlined in this paper. As was stated earlier, these components are not mutually exclusive. The overall effectiveness of the

program is based on the combined strength of all components. When one link is weakened, the entire program is in jeopardy. This will require a significant commitment on the part of a school district. However, if teacher evaluation is viewed as a legitimate school improvement activity, the effort will be well worth it in terms of benefits to administrators, teachers and students.

Summary

Teacher supervision and evaluation are difficult tasks, and unfortunately there are no panaceas. If there were, the profession would have latched onto them long before now.

Teacher supervision and evaluation are difficult tasks, and unfortunately there are no panaceas. If there were, the profession would have latched onto them long before now. After all, the age of accountability has been with us for some time, yet the profession is still searching for solutions to difficult problems with respect to defining and evaluating pedagogy. However, researchers and practitioners have been hard at work over the past twenty years and a defensible and practical system for teacher evaluation does now exist. That system is described in this paper.[5]

What is needed is a system of integrating the various instructional models within one evaluation framework.

Certainly there are alternative pedagogical designs as evidenced by outstanding leaders in the field such as David Berliner with his work in teacher decision-making (Berliner 1984, Brandt 1986) and Lee Shulman (1986) with integrating subject area knowledge into pedagogy. More established paradigms exist such as that developed by Madeline Hunter (1981, 1984) as do learning-style theories and models (for example Dunn & Dunn 1978 and; Gregorc 1982, 1986). Considered independently, none of these models meets all of the evaluation needs of a school district and when a district begins to pile one model on top of another, confusion and frustration set in. What is needed is a system of integrating the various instructional models within one evaluation framework. The model described in this paper meets these design requirements. It is not a panacea, but it is probably the best that is currently available to the profession. Districts should seriously consider its components if they desire to implement a comprehensive and practical teacher evaluation program.

Notes

1) For further information contact Dr. Raymond Pecheone at the Connecticut State Department of Education.
2) To demonstrate what is wrong with a Likert-type rating scale such as the one described in the text of the paper, consider Teacher A who has been observed and rated a four (4) concerning student discipline. Now consider another teacher from the same school, grade level and subject area. The same principal observes Teacher B and rates that teacher's performance with respect to discipline a two (2). Immediately the shortcomings of this type of rating scale should become apparent. First of all, Teacher B who was rated a two (2) will want to know at least two things: (a) what he/she has to do to make the district standard which is a three (3) and; (b) what Teacher A did to deserve a rating of four (4). Teacher A, satisfied with a higher rating than Teacher B still wants to know why he/she did not receive a five (5). These situations, as contrived as they may seem, are real to anyone who has had to use similar rating scales for reporting teacher performance. Unfortunately there are no adequate answers to any of the questions raised above. An administrator who tries to defend one such rating over another must rely solely on subjective opinion. Compound this problem of comparing teachers over schools, grades and subject areas and the extent of the consistency problem with respect to teacher assessment becomes obvious. Statistically speaking, a serious measurement problem exists with these rating scales. In order to compare performance, one has to ensure that the points of the scale are equidistant from one another. Put in other terms, a teacher would have to exhibit the same degree of performance going from a rating of two (2) to a three (3) as from a three (3) to a four (4). Unfortunately the current state of our measurement art in education does not allow for such precise calibration. Realizing these psychometric problems, as well as the problems of ensuring a high degree of rater reliability, large state-wide teacher assessment programs have abandoned the rating scale in favor of a more practical and defensible model -- the descriptor achievement system.
3) This author is currently working with the Connecticut State Department of Education on their Beginning Teacher Assessment and Support Program and recently attended a policy development session where it was decided to use the descriptor achievement system for assessing beginning teacher performance.
4) In large scale assessment programs, usually three independent observations of the same teacher are made by a team of observers/assessors. This cycle is repeated once for a total of six (6) independent observations. When any one observer's ratings is beyond an acceptable confidence interval from the other two observers, this observer is flagged as in danger of drift. That observer then undergoes follow up training and assessment. Only after successful recalibration is that observer allowed to continue making observations. Interested parties should contact Dr. Chad Ellett at Louisiana State University or Dr. William Capie at the University of Georgia, Athens, for more information.
5) The author wishes to acknowledge the contribution that Dr. Chad Ellett of Louisiana State University made to his understanding of the concepts presented in this paper. Dr. Ellett is one of the giants in the field who has worked on developing the program described over the past ten years. Moreover, he has had extensive experience with large scale observer/evaluator training programs. Dr. Ellett was a key consultant to the Dade County Public Schools and the Georgia Department of Education in the development of their teacher assessment programs. This author's knowledge of key concepts presented in this paper is directly attributable to his professional association with Dr. Ellett over the past two years. The content of this paper is, however, the sole responsibility of the author.

References

Berliner, D. (1984). The half-full glass: A review of research on teaching. In Philip Hosford (Ed.), Using what we know about teaching. Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brandt, R. (1986). On the expert teacher: A conversation with David Berliner. Educational Leadership, 44, 2 (October 1986); 4-9.

Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1978). Teaching students through their learning styles: A practical approach. Reston, VA.: Reston Pub. Co.

Dade County Public Schools. (1983). Teacher assessment and development system (TADS). Dade County, Florida. Author.

Education Commission of the States. (1985). New directions for state teacher policies. ECS working paper. Denver, Colorado. Author.

Georgia Department of Education. (1986). Teacher performance assessment instruments (TPAI). Atlanta, Georgia. Author.

Gregorc, A. F. (1982). An adult's guide to style. Maynard, MA: Gabriel Systems.

Gregorc, A. F. (1986). Inside style: Questions and answers. Maynard, MA: Gabriel Systems.

Hunter, M., & Russell, D. (1981). Planning for effective instruction: Lesson Design. In Increasing your teaching effectiveness. Palo Alto, CA: The Learning Institute.

Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching, and supervising. In Philip Hosford (Ed.), Using what we know about teaching. Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Shulman, L. (1986) Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A comparative perspective. In M. Wittrock (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching, Third Edition (pp. 3-36). New York: MacMillan Pub. Co.

South Carolina Department of Education. (1986). Assessments of performance in teaching observation instrument (APT). Columbia, South Carolina. Author.

Streifer, P. (1987) Validated teacher competency lists: A comparative analysis resulting in a generic model. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1987.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Public Health Services. (1977). Credentialling health manpower (DHEW Publication No. [05] 77-50057). Washington, D.C.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L. and McLaughlin, M.W. (1984). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices (R-3139-NIE). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Appendix A
Overview of Teaching Criteria from Streifer (1987)

I. PLANNING
- 1. Plans effective instruction.
  - 1.1 Identifies Instructional Goals and Objectives.
  - 1.2 Identifies and Sequences Instructional Activities.

II. INSTRUCTION
- 2. Maintains effective teacher/student interaction.
  - 2.1 Clearly states directions and expectations.
  - 2.2 Written and oral communication are acceptable.
  - 2.3 Clarifies confusion. 2.4 Stimulates discussion through effective questioning techniques.
- 3. Maintains a productive classroom environment.
  - 3.1 Maximizes student time on task.
  - 3.2 Effectively Manages the Classroom and Routines.
  - 3.3 Instructional sequence is logical.
- 4. Uses a varied teaching style.
  - 4.1 Effectively uses a variety of aids and materials.
  - 4.2 Uses a variety of instructional methods.
  - 4.3 Provides illustrations, examples, and applications of the material.
- 5. Maintains a positive learning environment.
  - 5.1 Demonstrates warmth and friendliness.
  - 5.2 Promotes courtesy and respect.
  - 5.3 Promotes student involvement and participation.
- 6. Maintains Effective Student Discipline.
  - 6.1 Maintains fair and consistent discipline (derived Connecticut factor).

III. STUDENT EVALUATION
- 7. Selects or creates effective evaluation techniques.
  - 7.1 Informally assesses student achievement.
  - 7.2 Creates and/or selects formal evaluation instruments.
  - 7.3 Provides individual and group progress feedback.
  - 7.4 Provides assistance to special needs students.

IV. PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE
- 8. Demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter being taught.

V. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES
- 9. Demonstrates professional behavior. 9.1 Follows district policies and procedures.
- 10. Maintains effective parent/community communication

Appendix B
Student Discipline Criteria from Streifer (1987)

6.0 Maintains Effective Student Discipline.

6.1 Maintains fair and consistent discipline (derived Connecticut factor).

6.1.1 Expectations for behavior conducive to learning are stated or have been established for students. (South Carolina APT 3A)

The expected behavior is stated or the conduct of students may indicate that expectations for behavior have been previously communicated (e.g., responding to signals without explicit directions). If stated during the lesson, the expectations should deal with student behavior (e.g., "I want you to listen carefully...") as opposed to the instructional plan (e.g., "We are going to learn..."). The emphasis in this observation statement is on what the teacher communicates to students about behavior and not the teacher's firmness in managing behavior. At least one demonstration of this skill or the continuing expected behavior of the students throughout the period is necessary for credit.

6.1.2 Consistent expectations about behavior are maintained throughout the lesson. (Georgia TPAI 29B)

Self-explanatory.

6.1.3 Behavior of the entire class is monitored throughout the lesson. (Georgia TPAI 30A)

Monitoring is the surveillance of the group to promote appropriate classroom behavior. It must involve all learners for whom the teacher is responsible. Monitoring might be observed directly or its results, such as feedback and reinforcement, might be observed. If the teacher fails to scan the class periodically or to acknowledge desirable or undesirable behavior, credit should not be given for this descriptor.

6.1.4 Firmness of the teacher in managing behavior conveys confidence. (South Carolina APT 3B)

The teacher enforces limits, provides leadership, and demonstrates authority with consistency. Frequent use of idle threats, intimidation, or unenforced directives denies credit. The teacher appears self-assured in managing behavior.

6.1.5 Learners who interfere with instruction are identified and dealt with appropriately (e.g., firmly, with suitable consequences for situation, effectively, etc.). (Georgia TPAI 30D)

Self-explantory.

6.1.6 Learners are provided verbal and non-verbal feedback about specific behavior(s). (Dade County Florida TADS)

To maintain appropriate behavior, feedback should be provided to learners about appropriate behavior. The age and nature of the learner should be taken into consideration. Young learners may need more frequent feedback than older learners.

6.1.7 When correcting misbehavior, the teacher provides for appropriate behavioral alternatives. (Dade County Florida TADS)

Requesting students to "stop that!" ... or ... "don't do that!" is insufficient for bringing about positive behavior change. Once inappropriate behaviors are halted, behavioral alternatives should be suggested. Fro example, "put your materials on the shelf rather than the floor" is preferred to "don't put your materials on the floor!" Alternative behaviors are "avenues" for constructive behavior change.

6.1.8 The teacher calls attention to desirable behaviors. (Virginia R3)

District Self-Assessment Checklist for Teacher Evaluation

Developed by
Philip A. Streifer, Ph.D.
for the Rhode Island Leadership Academy

August 1987

Section I Directions. Listed below are a series of indicators designed to help school district staff determine if all of the necessary components of an effective teacher evaluation program are in place. Respond to each item with a "yes" or "no" indicating whether or not the component is currently being met. At the end of segment A, B, C and D total the number of "yes" responses in the space provided. Having completed all four segments, turn to Section II for a summary of your data.

Segment A: District Policies and Procedures.

_____ 1) The district establishes the minimum number of classroom observations to be conducted for each tenured and non-tenured teacher.

_____ 2) A pre and post conference is required for each classroom observation.

_____ 3) It is established whether classroom observations are announced or unannounced to the teacher. This policy is carried out consistently across the district.

_____ 4) Administrative procedures are monitored frequently by the central office to ensure consistency across the district.

_____ 5) Teachers falling below the district standard are provided immediate feedback and assistance in the days and weeks following the classroom observation.

_____ 6) At the conclusion of a formal summative evaluation, provision is made for providing intensive assistance to teachers falling below district standards the following year.

_____ 7) Procedures are in place that ensure due process for teachers throughout the evaluation process.

_____ 8) A committee or panel is established, preferably comprised of both teachers and administrators, to hear and adjudicate appeals by teachers throughout the teacher evaluation process.

_____ 9) It is clearly established in policy as to when and for what reasons formal termination proceedings will commence. This policy is consistently followed across the district.

_____ 10) A time table is established to periodically review all of the components of the teacher evaluation program and make changes as necessary.

Segment A: Enter the total number of "yes" responses to the indicators above.

_____

Segment B. Teacher Performance Criteria.

_____ 1) A panel of teachers and administrators has reviewed the teacher performance criteria and agree as to their relevance (a process known as content validation).

_____ 2) The criteria are defined sufficiently so as to eliminate confusion regarding their meaning, interpretation and application.

Criteria included in the district list cover the following broad areas (see Streifer 1987[1] for the complete list and all definitions):

_____ 3) Teacher planning and instructional sequence.
_____ 4) Maintaining effective teacher/student interaction.
_____ 5) Maintaining a productive classroom environment.
_____ 6) Uses a varied teaching style.
_____ 7) Maintaining a positive learning environment.
_____ 8) Maintaining effective student discipline.
_____ 9) Selecting and creating effective student evaluation techniques.
_____ 10) Demonstrating knowledge of the subject matter being taught.
_____ 11) Demonstrating professional behavior.
_____ 12) Maintaining effective parent/community communication.

Segment B: Enter the total number of "yes" responses to the indicators above.

_____

Segment C. Setting District Performance Standards.

_____ 1) The method of rating teacher performance is statistically defensible. The district uses a dichotomous rating format rather than the popular five (5) point Likert-type scale.

_____ 2) The district establishes the data collection strategies by which each of the performance criteria will be assessed.

[1]Streifer, P. (1987). Validated teacher competency lists: A comparative analysis resulting in a generic model. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1987. Available from the Rhode Island Educational Leadership Academy, 78 Foxglove Drive, Cranston, RI 02920.

_____ 3) Minimum district performance standards have been established for each subset of teaching criteria. Setting of these standards has been carried out cooperatively with teachers.

_____ 4) No single performance criterion within a subset is weighted more heavily than others. Moreover, no single criterion is mandatory within the list.

_____ 5) A consistent and logical method of aggregating observational data for summative evaluation use is established.

_____ 6) A procedure is established to periodically (but regularly) have more than one observer rate each teacher to check for reliability.

Segment C: Enter the total number of "yes" responses to the indicators above.

_____

Segment D. Training and Inservice.

_____ 1) Teachers have been included in the development of the teacher evaluation program.

_____ 2) Administrators (those responsible for observing and rating teaching performance) have been adequately trained in the area of effective instruction.

_____ 3) Administrators (those responsible for observing and rating teaching performance) have undergone training on how to rate teaching performance with respect to the district criteria and minimum performance standards.

_____ 4) Administrators are not permitted to observe and rate teaching performance without having met a minimum reliability check.

_____ 5) Procedures are in place and carried out by the central office that ensure ongoing reliability checks of administrative performance in their rating of teachers.

_____ 6) Teachers have been provided adequate inservice regarding the policies and procedures of the teacher evaluation program.

_____ 7) Teachers are given a year to learn the teaching criteria before being evaluated against them.

Segment D: Enter the total number of "yes" responses to the indicators above.

_____

Section II Directions. Use this section to compile the responses from segments A, B, C and D (Section I). Circle the total number of "yes" responses from each segment on the appropriate scale below:

Segment A: District Policies and Procedures.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Low Degree of Implementation — High Degree of Implementation

Segment B: Teacher Performance Criteria.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Low Degree of Implementation — High Degree of Implementation

Segment C: Setting District Performance Standards.

1 2 3 4 5 6

Low Degree of Implementation — High Degree of Implementation

Segment D: Training and Inservice.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Low Degree of Implementation — High Degree of Implementation

By completing this checklist, school administrators can begin the process of determining the extent to which they have implemented the components of an effective teacher evaluation program. This checklist is not intended to serve as an exhaustive assessment of a district's program. Rather, it is intended to provide a springboard from which school districts can organize faculty and staff discussions regarding the effectiveness of their teacher evaluation program. It may also provide the basis upon which specific district goals are identified in an improvement effort.